REMARKS

I.   INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended. Claims 16-18 have been added. Support for these amendments can be found at least at page 4 lines 17-25 and page 5 lines 26-29 of the specification. Thus, claims 1 and 4-18 are now pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In light of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II.   THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1 and 4-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Brill et al. (U.S. Published App. No. 2002/0169596) in view of Schabes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,317) and further in view of Papineni et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,710).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "[a] method carried out by a processor, comprising: extracting a phrase from a training corpus; calculating a probability that the phrase is mapped to a semantic tag from a list of unordered semantic tags; mapping the phrase to the semantic tag with the highest mapping probability; and generating a mapping table containing the phrase and its corresponding semantic tag, wherein *a weak annotation between the phrase and the semantic tag is provided to the processor.*"

Brill discloses a system that comprises two sets of processing units (300, 302). Each set of processing units is provided with the same sentence, but in a different language (language S corpus and language E corpus). (See Brill, ¶ [0023]). After the processing units derive the meaning from the sentences, a score is generated. This score is a comparison of the two meaning sets. (See Id., ¶ [0031]). The purpose of Brill's system is the convergence of the two meaning sets toward each other. (See Id., ¶ [0021]). Brill fails to disclose or suggest that a week annotation between either of the language corpora (language S corpus and language E corpus) and either of the meaning sets is provided to either of the processing units (300, 302).

The system of Schabes uses a module (26) to select a correct sentence for an input sentence (S1). The inputs to the module are "the probabilities of the various sentences as well as

the input sentence. This module is provided with a list of easily confused words." (See Schabes, col. 3, ll. 50-54). Schabes discloses that the "words in the sentence S1 may be part of a list of easily confused words, in which case, all possible alternative sentences S2 to the sentence S1 are generated according to list 36." (See Id., col. 9, ll. 7-10). Applicant respectfully submits that a list of easily confused words is not a "weak annotation between the phrase and semantic tag."

The system of Papineni concerns the translation of a natural language sentence to an artificial/target language sentence recognizable by the computer. (See Papineni, col. 3, ll. 20-23). Applicants respectfully submit that Papineni fails to cure the deficiencies of Brill and Schabes and that Brill, Schabes, and Papineni, fail to disclose or suggest *"a weak annotation between the phrase and the semantic tag is provided to the processor,"* as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 5, and 16 are allowable.

Independent claim 6 recites, *"a weak annotation between the phrase and the semantic tag is provided to the processor."* Applicant submits that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Because claims 7-10 and 17 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Independent claim 11 recites, *"a weak annotation between the phrase and the semantic tag is provided to the processor."* Applicant submits that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Because claims 12-15 and 18 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 11.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 5, 2010   By:_____

Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276